

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 11-31 are pending in this application.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that Claims 20 and 21 are allowed.

Claims 11-19 and 22-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemmochi et al. (US 2004/0032706) in view of Nakamata et al. (U.S. 6,683,512). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 11-19 and 22-31.

Claim 11 recites:

A high-frequency composite component comprising:  
a switch for selectively switching a signal path between an antenna terminal and a transmission-side input terminal and a signal path between the antenna and a reception-side balanced output terminal;  
an LC filter including an inductor and capacitors disposed between the antenna terminal and the transmission-side input terminal;  
a surface acoustic wave filter disposed between the switch and the reception-side balanced output terminal; and  
**a matching element including an inductor and capacitors disposed between the surface acoustic wave filter and the reception-side balanced output terminal;** wherein  
the switch, the LC filter, the surface acoustic wave filter, and the matching element are integrated in a laminated block including a plurality of laminated dielectric layers. (emphasis added)

Applicant's Claim 22 recites features and that are similar to the features recited in Applicant's Claim 11, including the above-emphasized features.

With the unique combination and arrangement of features recited in Applicant's Claims 11 and 22, including the feature of "a matching element including an inductor and capacitors disposed between the surface acoustic wave filter and the reception-side balanced output terminal," Applicant has been able to provide a high frequency composite component in which a desired impedance is easily set in the high-frequency composite component itself, no matching adjustment to an LNA is required, the number of components is reduced, and the overall size is reduced. (see, for example, paragraph [0007] on page 3 of the Substitute Specification).

The Examiner alleged that Kemmochi et al. teaches all of the features recited in claims 11 and 22, except for a matching element including an inductor and capacitors disposed between the surface acoustic wave filter and the reception-side balanced output terminal, wherein the switch, the LC filter, the surface acoustic wave filter, and the matching element are integrated in a laminated block including a plurality of laminated dielectric layers. The Examiner further alleged that Nakamata et al. teaches these features. Thus, the Examiner concluded that it would have been obvious “to incorporate the teachings of Nakamata et al. into the teachings of Kemmochi et al. for the purpose of reducing size and having advantageous characteristics...” Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Each of the matching circuits MAT 10, MAT 20 of Nakamata et al. is disposed between the SAW filter DIP 10 and **transmission terminals** DCS TX, GSM TX, **NOT** between the SAW filter DIP 10 and a **reception-side balanced output terminal** as recited in Applicant’s Claims 11 and 22. Nakamata et al. fails to teach or suggest any matching circuits disposed between the SAW filter DIP 10 and either of the reception-side terminals DCS RX and GSM RX, or that a matching circuit could or should be disposed between the SAW filter DIP 10 and either of the reception-side terminals DCS RX and GSM RX. Thus, contrary to the Examiner’s allegations, Nakamata et al. certainly fails to teach or suggest the feature of “a matching element including an inductor and capacitors disposed between the surface acoustic wave filter and the reception-side balanced output terminal” as recited in Applicant’s Claim 11, and similarly in Applicant’s Claim 22.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Kemmochi et al. and Nakamata et al., applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of features recited in Applicant’s Claims 11 and 22.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 11 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemmochi et al. in view of Nakamata et al.

Application S.N. 10/595,260  
October 2, 2007  
Reply to the Office Action dated June 6, 2007  
Page 11 of 11

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 11 and 22 are allowable. Claims 12-19 and 23-31 depend upon Claims 11 and 22, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that Claims 11 and 22 are allowable. Claims 20 and 21 have been allowed by the Examiner.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions the Commissioner for a One-Month Extension of Time, extending to October 6, 2007, the period for response to the Office Action dated June 6, 2007.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 2, 2007

/Christopher A. Bennett #46,710/  
Attorneys for Applicant

**KEATING & BENNETT, LLP**  
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 850  
Tyson's Corner, VA 22102  
Telephone: (703) 637-1480  
Facsimile: (703) 637-1499

Joseph R. Keating  
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett  
Registration No. 46,710